

JPRS 93907

18 July 1983

Worldwide Report

NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT AND PROLIFERATION

No. 196

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

18 July 1983

WORLDWIDE REPORT
NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT AND PROLIFERATION

No. 196

CONTENTS

ASIA

AUSTRALIA

| | |
|--|----|
| Rising U.S. Uranium Consumption Bodes Well for Mines (THE AUSTRALIAN, 31 May 83; THE WEST AUSTRALIAN, 2 Jun 83)..... | 1 |
| Supply Situation, by Don Kirkwood Government OK of Sales | |
| Officials See Australia as Target in Any Nuclear Conflict (THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 30, 31 May 83) | 3 |
| West German's Views, by Richard Glover Government Admission, by Amanda Buckley | |
| Government To Take Firmer Stand on Nuclear Disarmament (THE COURIER-MAIL, 31 May 83)..... | 5 |
| Poll Shows Public Opposes Antinuclear Demonstrations (THE COURIER-MAIL, 18 May 83)..... | 7 |
| Government Protests, Retaliates Over French Nuclear Test (THE AUSTRALIAN, 27 May, 9 Jun 83)..... | 8 |
| Reaction To Blast in Pacific Ban on Uranium for French, by Russell Schneider | |
| Despite ALP Policy, Uranium Exports Get Government Nod (THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 1 Jun 83)..... | 11 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Western Mining Corp Presses for OK on Giant Uranium Mine (THE AUSTRALIAN, 9 Jun 83)..... | 12 |
| Fund for Health Claims in Uranium Industry Sought (Peter Roberts; THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 18 May 83)..... | 14 |
| Briefs | |
| Radioactive Dumping | 15 |
| Study of Radioactive Mussels | 15 |
| FRENCH POLYNESIA | |
| Aftermath of French Nuclear Testing in Pacific (Michael Hamel-Green; BUSINESS TIMES, 2 May 83)..... | 16 |
| LATIN AMERICA | |
| BRAZIL | |
| NUCLEBRAS Suspends Several Nuclear Projects (O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 3 Jul 83)..... | 18 |
| CUBA | |
| Briefs | |
| Atomic Energy Agreement | 19 |
| NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA | |
| INDIA | |
| Briefs | |
| Nuclear Test Preparations Denied | 20 |
| PATRIOT Reports Explosion by Pakistan | 20 |
| Spokesman Unsure of Pakistani Explosion | 20 |
| PAKISTAN | |
| Pakistan Reported To Have Exploded Nuclear Device (R. K. Mishra; PATRIOT, 25 Jun 83)..... | 22 |

WEST EUROPE

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

- Swedish Daily Attacks Secret Provisions of N-Pact With
France
(Editorial; Olle Alsen; DAGENS NYHETER, 17 Jun 83)..... 24

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

- Plans for Radioactive Waste Disposal Described
(Carsten Salander; HANDELSBLATT, 30 May 83)..... 27
- Status of Future Nuclear Power Plants
(Werner H. F. Hunlich; HANDELSBLATT, 30 May 83)..... 32

FINLAND

- Amendments in Nuclear Power Law Code Examined
(Markku Hurmeranta; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 14 Jun 83)..... 35
- Reluctant Parliament Getting Proposal for New Nuclear
Unit
(Hannu Leinonen; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 14 Jun 83)..... 39

SWEDEN

- Forsmark Plant Given Permission To Store Spent Fuel
(Owe Nilsson; DAGENS NYHETER, 23 Jun 83)..... 44
- Briefs
Nuclear Experts to Harrisburg 47

RISING U.S. URANIUM CONSUMPTION BODES WELL FOR MINES

Supply Situation

Canberra THE AUSTRALIAN in English 31 May 83 p 13

[Article by Don Kirkwood]

[Text]

FOR the first time in decades, the consumption of uranium in the United States is outrunning domestic supply, according to Nuexco, one of the major sources of information on the world uranium industry.

This trend is likely to accelerate as a great deal of US capacity has been taken out of production and is unlikely to be recommissioned.

US consumption in 1982 was 9483 tonnes of uranium oxide, while production was 30 per cent lower than in 1981 at 11,751 tonnes.

Consumption is rising steadily and will reach 13,793 tonnes next year, but in the meantime, production is continuing to fall and will drop to only 5445 tonnes next year.

But the US has stockpiles which will satisfy domestic production until 1988, when inventories will amount to two years' supply and the country is expected to become a major net importer at that point.

This is good news for Australia's potential producers, assuming they are allowed to produce, and a further optimistic development is taking place.

Major customers of the giant Rossing uranium mine in Namibia, which is 46.5 per cent owned by the Rio Tinto-Zinc group of the UK, are seeking to diversify major contracts due soon for renewal.

With a capacity of 5500 tonnes of uranium oxide a year, Rossing is the world's largest uranium mine with apparently vast reserves.

The major customers are the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) of the UK, France's Minatome, and Minserv, RTZ's Swiss uranium marketing subsidiary.

The UK takes between 1100 tonnes and 1500 tonnes a year, while France is building up to 1800 tonnes.

Most of the remainder is marketed throughout the world by Minserv, with a very large proportion going to Japan.

Namibia's political future is troubled, which is one reason why major customers wish to diversify their sources of supply. The other is that Britain and Japan feel they are too dependent on one mine as a source of supply.

The small contractual arrangement entered into between Pancontinental Mining Ltd and the CEGB earlier this year is a practical demonstration of both those concerns.

Possibly half of the contracted supplies the CEGB presently receives from Rossing will be sought elsewhere, while the amount Japan will be seeking elsewhere will probably amount to at least the same quantity.

The UK contracts come up for renewal as from next year, while the French contract comes up for renegotiation in

1990.

Through its formidable sales arm, RTZ and its partners should be able to continue to operate their mine at full capacity for many years, especially with the international market moving in favor of the producers.

There is only one major new north American mine scheduled to come on stream this decade, and that is Key Lake in Canada, with a capacity approximately similar to that of Rossing.

There would appear to be a bright future for Australia's uranium miners.

Government OK of Sales

Perth THE WEST AUSTRALIAN in English 2 Jun 83 p 20

[Text]

CANBERRA. — The Federal Government has given special licences to two Australian companies to negotiate new uranium export contracts, although this conflicts directly with the ALP policy on uranium.

Energy Resources of Australia (ERA) and Queensland Mines have been given authority by the Department of Trade to negotiate new contracts. Both companies have mines already producing uranium yellowcake — ERA at Ranger and Queensland Mines at Nabarlek.

The ALP platform commits an incoming Labor Government to repudiating all existing uranium commitments entered into by the previous Government.

It specifically binds the Government not to permit the export

of uranium pursuant to agreements entered into contrary to ALP policy.

Although the Government has affirmed that existing uranium contracts will be honoured pending the Government's policy review, the party's minimum position is a total, unequivocal commitment to phase out Australia's involvement in the uranium industry.

A spokesman for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade, Mr Bowen, confirmed that several companies had applied for and been granted new licences.

It is believed that ERA and Queensland Mines have been given permission to respond to a tender from a North American power utility.

CSO: 5100/7535

OFFICIALS SEE AUSTRALIA AS TARGET IN ANY NUCLEAR CONFLICT

West German's Views

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 30 May 83 p 10

[Article by Richard Glover]

[Text]

Australians would be in as much danger as the people of Europe in a large-scale nuclear war, a West German parliamentarian and member of the Green Party, Mr Roland Vogt, warned yesterday.

Mr Vogt is in Australia to address an international conference on the consequences of nuclear war, which is being held today and tomorrow at the Australian National University in Canberra.

The conference will be addressed by scientists and doctors from Australia, the United States and the Soviet Union, and by the Australian author Mr Patrick White.

Mr Vogt, who was one of 28 members of the anti-nuclear Green Party to win a seat in this year's German elections, said the conference would disprove any notion that Australia would escape the consequences of a nuclear war.

"Australia would be a prime target because of her American bases,

but even in the unlikely event that war was confined to Europe, your country would still suffer terribly from increased radiation and the destruction of the ozone layer," he said.

Mr Vogt said Australia has a special role to play in the struggle against nuclear war because of its uranium reserves.

"The use of nuclear power for civilian and military uses are Siamese twins and we can only be sure of survival if uranium is left unmined," he said.

Mr Vogt is a unilateralist, arguing that attempts at bilateral arms reductions have always floundered because of the mutual distrust between the superpowers.

He will speak about the European anti-nuclear movement at the conference tomorrow, while Patrick White will speak about the role of the Australian citizen in preventing nuclear war.

The conference will be opened this morning by the Vice-Chancellor of the ANU, Professor Peter Karmel.

Government Admission

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 31 May 83 p 1

[Article by Amanda Buckley]

[Text]

CANBERRA. — The Federal Government acknowledges that North-West Cape communications base is a prime nuclear target, but is willing to support its continued presence as long as

it remains part of a system of nuclear deterrence.

Senator Susan Ryan, Federal Minister for Education, set out this position at the Australian National University yesterday

during a conference on the consequences of nuclear war.

She said Australia could not hope to avoid these consequences simply by an accident of geography.

The joint Australian-US facilities at North-West Cape, Pine Gap and Nurrungar had critical roles to play in the world nuclear balance. "The North-West Cape communications base is a prime nuclear target because of its crucial role in command control and communications functions with US nuclear-armed missile submarines."

The Government supported the presence of these facilities "on certain strict conditions, as long as they continue to support a system of nuclear deterrence," Senator Ryan said.

The strict conditions she was referring to have previously been outlined by the Foreign Minister, Mr Hayden, and are enshrined in the Labor Party's platform.

These are: that a Labor Government will ensure foreign or jointly owned bases in Australia will not involve a "derogation from Australian sovereignty"; that a Labor Government will ensure it is kept informed of changes in the strategic planning or policies of the United States which could affect the nature of the bases or the uses to which they may be put, and that a Labor Government will try to ensure that Australian personnel are fully involved in all aspects of the bases' operations.

Senator Ryan said the Government was determined to play an active role in international arms control and disarmament, with a sense of urgency at the growing danger of nuclear war.

At the next meeting of the South Pacific Forum, Australia would propose a south-west Pacific nuclear-free zone.

GOVERNMENT TO TAKE FIRMER STAND ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Brisbane THE COURIER-MAIL in English 31 May 83 p 3

[Text]

CANBERRA.— Australia will take a much firmer stand on nuclear disarmament and arms control.

This was stressed in a major policy speech last night by the Federal Education Minister, Senator Ryan, to delegates attending an international symposium in Canberra on the consequences of a nuclear war for Australia.

The Labor Government has previously pledged its determination to play a much more active role in international arms control and disarmament.

Last night's speech showed just how far the Government was prepared to take that pledge.

Senator Ryan told the symposium at the Australian National University that "no country can escape the consequences of nuclear war by accident or geography".

The new initiatives she announced included:

- The use of major international forums, including the United Nations, to urge the superpowers to resume control of new technology "rather than allowing technology to become the driving force of our destruction".

- The appointment of a special UN ambassador for disarmament to represent Australia in all international forums on disarmament and arms control.

- The raising at the next meeting of the South Pacific Forum in August of Labor's proposal for a nuclear-free zone. The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and the Foreign Minister, Mr Hayden, are expected to attend the meeting in Canberra.

- The Government's determination to resist all attempts to undermine the safeguards regime established under the Treaty for Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

- The capability of many government departments, especially Foreign Affairs, will be strengthened to work more effectively in the disarmament area. This will be done in consultation with the ANU.

- The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva will be urged to take urgent action to identify issues for negotiation in "the coming area for superpower arms competition in outer space".

- The Government will not stand in the way of a consensus to hold an international conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Senator Ryan said the Government recognised that if Australia was to have credibility in attempting to play a more active role in disarmament and arms control, "we will have to strengthen greatly our capacity for analysis and policy formulation in this area".

Australia already had announced its support for a ban on attacks on civilian nuclear facilities.

"We are also reviewing our record on ratification of and reservations to existing disarmament treaties," she said.

"In contrast to our predecessors, we will not stand in the way of consensus to hold an international conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace."

The Government believed that with-

out superpower talks and restraint, multilateral efforts towards disarmament had become paralysed.

"With progress between the superpowers, there is much that can be done multilaterally," Senator Ryan said.

The Government already had protested vigorously to the French Government about its continued nuclear testing in the Pacific.

Senator Ryan said the Government supported the presence of the controversial US communications bases in Australia "on certain strict conditions, as long as they continue to support a system of nuclear deterrence".

The Government saw the North-West Cape facility near Exmouth in Western Australia as a prime nuclear target because of its crucial role in command control and communications functions with nuclear-armed US submarines.

CSO: 5100/7534

POLL SHOWS PUBLIC OPPOSES ANTINUCLEAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Brisbane THE COURIER-MAIL in English 18 May 83 p 14

[Text]

FIFTY-SEVEN percent of Australians oppose anti-nuclear demonstrations in Australia, according to the Gallup Poll.

Forty percent support anti-nuclear demonstrations and 3 percent are unsure.

The same poll shows that Australians are fairly equally divided on whether the United States should develop nuclear space missiles — 49 percent are in favor and 46 percent opposed. Five percent are unsure.

A further poll result shows that 44 percent of Australians want the US to cut back on nuclear arms production even if the Soviet Union does not make a similar cut-back.

Fifty-one percent do not want the US to make such a reduction in nuclear arms production. Five percent are unsure.

The poll was conducted in April among 2038 people throughout Australia. Those interviewed were asked:

• Should the United States cut back on nuclear arms production even if a similar reduction in Soviet Union nuclear arms does not occur?

clear arms does not occur?

• Should the United States continue with the development of nuclear space missiles?

• Do you support anti-nuclear demonstrations in Australia?

Majorities of people in all states opposed anti-nuclear demonstrations.

Liberal-National Party voters particularly were opposed to anti-nuclear demonstrations — 74 percent being opposed and 24 percent in favor.

ALP voters were fairly equally divided on anti-nuclear demonstrations — 50 percent being in favor and 47 percent opposed.

Liberal-National Party voters were much more inclined than ALP voters to favor the development of US nuclear space missiles and to oppose the reduction of US nuclear arms.

Copyright: Australian Public Opinion Polls (The Gallup Method.)

CSO: 5100/7534

GOVERNMENT PROTESTS, RETALIATES OVER FRENCH NUCLEAR TEST

Reaction to Blast in Pacific

Canberra THE AUSTRALIAN in English 27 May 83 p 2

[Text]

FRANCE yesterday exploded a large nuclear device on Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific and sparked the strongest reaction yet from the Australian Government.

The 70 kilotonne explosion has been confirmed by a New Zealand seismological receiving station and is much larger than any previously detected.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Hayden, claimed he was misled by the French Foreign Minister, Mr Cheysson, over the extent of French testing in the Pacific when they met earlier this month.

In the absence of the French ambassador, the charge d'affairs was summoned to Mr Hayden's office. An official protest was sent to the French Government and Mr Hayden said he would be aiming to develop greater militancy and cohesion between Australia, New Zealand and south-west Pacific nations to oppose further testing.

Following news of the test, the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, approved the appointment of a full-time Australian ambassador for disarmament to be based in Geneva.

"If they're determined to test these things then let them test the damned things in the Atlantic, Mediterranean or mainland France," Mr Hayden said.

"Let them keep out of our backyard."

He said that during his Paris visit he was assured by the French that they did not test nuclear explosive weaponry, only trigger devices.

"This explosion goes well beyond a trigger device."

"I will be making it clear that persistence with this testing program and its elevation puts the Franco-Australian relationship under very serious strain indeed."

"I was shocked and disturbed at the size of the explosion."

Protest

"France is testing a very large theatre weapon or they are developing a new cruise missile capacity, but it represents an elevation of the French nuclear program."

Mr Hayden conceded that France was likely to ignore Australia's latest protest, but said he would be working towards making life uncomfortable for them.

Australia would press for a south-west Pacific nuclear-free zone when the South Pacific Forum meets in Canberra in August.

The appointment of a full-time Australian ambassador for disarmament was put to the Prime Minister by Mr Hayden recently.

The ambassador's role will be to work for a comprehensive test ban treaty by encouraging countries to participate, and to work in other areas such as a convention in relation to chemical warfare.

The Department of Foreign Affairs nuclear safeguards and disarmament branch is also to be upgraded.

Mr Hayden said Mr Hawke would make a strong protest to the French President, Mr Mitterand, when he visits Paris next month.

Ban on Uranium for French

Canberra THE AUSTRALIAN in English 9 Jun 83 p 1

[Article by Russell Schneider]

[Text]

PARIS: The Federal Government has decided to suspend uranium exports to France in a bid to halt French nuclear testing in the Pacific.

The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, revealed the decision last night while flying from London to Paris where he will discuss it with President Mitterrand.

Mr Hawke stressed the Government was carrying out a total review of uranium policy.

The decision was taken by the Cabinet at Mr Hawke's insistence before he left.

But it was hoped to keep it secret until it had been discussed with Mr Mitterrand.

However, as news began to leak out and as the Government came under fire for moving away from official ALP policy, Mr Hawke decided to publicly announce it.

The decision will hold up a shipment of uranium due to leave Australia within the next month — part of the 2600 tonnes France has contracted to buy.

Mr Hawke said yesterday there was now no guarantee the shipment would proceed.

He has now locked himself and the Cabinet into an extremely tough stance on uranium exports, which honors the party's official position but risks Australia's trading reputation.

Official ALP policy says quite explicitly that there should be no uranium contracts with France unless it agrees to stop testing in the Pacific.

The French Government has made it clear it has no intention of halting the tests, which it says are vital to its defence posture.

Mr Hawke arrived in Paris late last night (Australian time) and will meet French leaders tomorrow.

He said on his flight to Paris the question of uranium exports had been discussed in the Cabinet at his instigation.

"We adopted a position that

there would be no authorisation of shipments to France under existing contracts before I have an opportunity of going to Paris and discussing matters relevant to this issue," he said.

"A shipment was due to go out in June and there will be no authorisation of that until I have had these discussions."

The Australian embassy conveyed the decision to the French Government the day Mr Hawke left Australia. It told the French Mr Hawke wanted to raise the issues directly with Mr Mitterrand.

Reinforcing his own position with the party, Mr Hawke said that contrary to some impressions in Australia "there is no guarantee that these shipments will proceed".

He has come under considerable pressure to re-endorse the official platform on uranium. The Victorian ALP has demanded a special conference to thrash out the issue.

Mr Hawke's remarks are expected to reduce some of this pressure.

The Government had decided that shipments planned under existing contracts would proceed provided all safeguard arrangements were adhered to.

But this decision did not now extend to France.

"France comes into a different category," Mr Hawke said.

"I was not prepared to let the shipment go ahead without discussing these issues with the French."

"It is quite clear that the decision of the French Government to undertake this new series of tests in the Pacific has created a new situation in which there cannot be any expectation that the Australians will simply go ahead with the existing arrangements."

Mr Hawke refused to say whether he would be pressing for a total ban on tests or would accept some concessions.

But he added: "Obviously if the Australian Government is faced with a situation where the French Government are going to offer no concessions

at all, then it would be very difficult, in the light of the feeling in Australia, to say to the French 'this will not affect supplies to your country'."

Mr Hawke said he did not wish to disclose all his options before his talks with Mr Mitterrand.

Meanwhile, *Jan Perkin* reports from Canberra that the entire question of uranium development and export is now being considered by a five-man Cabinet committee and a final recommendation is likely to be put to the national executive meeting on June 29.

Reports that the Government has already approved negotiations by two companies - Energy Resources and Australia and Queensland Mines - for future uranium contracts are already causing concern within the ALP.

It is well known that Mr Hawke has been a supporter of a more pragmatic approach to the uranium export and mining issue.

CSO: 5100/7534

DESPITE ALP POLICY, URANIUM EXPORTS GET GOVERNMENT NOD

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 1 Jun 83 p 1

[Text]

CANBERRA: The Federal Government had allowed two uranium-mining companies to negotiate the sale of uranium to the U.S., the Senate was told yesterday.

The Resources and Energy Minister Senator Walsh, said that Energy Resources of Australia Ltd and Queensland Mines had been told they could resume negotiations with U.S. electric-power authorities.

Senator Walsh also said that existing contracts to supply uranium were being honoured but no new contracts were being approved.

Senator Walsh's comments appear to conflict with the ALP's uranium policy which calls for the phasing out of uranium mining and the repudiation of existing commitments.

Review

He told the Senate during question time that the Government was reviewing its uranium policy, but he could not say when that would be completed.

He said that the companies had been allowed to resume negotiations to maintain a market presence pending the completion of the review.

A departmental informant said that the Minister for Trade, Mr Bowen, had given approval for negotiations to resume.

Senator Walsh's announcement was criticised today by the Australian Democrats' spokesman on resources, Senator Michael Macklin (Qld.).

Senator Macklin, in a statement, said that the Government had abandoned its anti-uranium policy.

He said that the Government's review was being held concurrently with new contracts being negotiated.

"How can you enter into negotiations for new contracts at the same time as the policy is being reviewed?" he asked.

CSO: 5100/7535

WESTERN MINING CORP PRESSES FOR OK ON GIANT URANIUM MINE

Canberra THE AUSTRALIAN in English 9 Jun 83 p 2

[Text]

THE giant Western Mining Corporation yesterday pressed the Federal Government to issue an unequivocal statement on uranium policy by announcing that the company was all but ready to start construction on its controversial Yeelirrie mine.

The company's director of operations, Mr Keith Parry, said if export sales contracts were completed, construction at the Yeelirrie site in Western Australia could start next year.

But in proposing the date for the project - expected to cost at least \$300 million - Mr Parry slammed government delays for endangering the mining project, and other projects like it.

"The Yeelirrie uranium project which was started 13 years ago and on which \$35 million has already been spent, could, subject to sales contracts being organised, commence construction next year and be a significant employer," said Mr Parry.

"But I can tell you with some feeling that its owners are extremely discouraged with the bloody-mindedness of a vociferous minority opposition and government shilly-shallying which has dogged it since its discovery."

Mr Parry's statement is the first to suggest that WMC is ready to go ahead with the project since the announcement a year ago that its main partner, Esso, was pulling out of the venture.

Immediately after the recent State election in Western Australia, the new State Labor Government came under pressure to pronounce its attitude to the project.

But it was able to avoid the issue by saying it had received no approach from Western Mining for consent for the project to go ahead.

Late yesterday, the State again avoided the issue by referring the matter immediately to the Federal Government for comment.

A State government official said: "No decision has been made on whether Yeelirrie will be allowed to sell uranium overseas - it is a matter for the Federal Government."

It is in the ALP's State party platform that no new uranium mine developments be allowed to start or come on stream in Western Australia.

Mr Parry made his announcement in a speech in Perth to a forum to mark Western Australia Week.

He claimed that while the mining industry was working hard to generate wealth for the benefit of the whole community a small "but vociferous part of the community, including government" was trying with equal strength to frustrate and hinder such activity.

"The main question I would ask is why do they do it in the first place, and why do we, the public, put up with it," he said.

Mr Parry said a good example of these frustrations would be provided by looking at Western Mining's nickel operations.

"The time from drilling the first hole into a new orebody to shipping concentrates was less than two years, and yet that would be at least a billion-dollar project in today's terms, and employs directly 2500 people," he said.

"Discussion with government was minimal and the

development was actively encouraged.

"Today we would have to deal with a multiplicity of government departments and the lead time would be infinitely longer, with marketing opportunities being lost, as in the case with the Yeelirrie uranium project."

Tyrannical

Mr Parry said he was also concerned by the development of various protest movements that appeared to have got into the hands of a minority of groups.

He said these groups were interconnected, and had become tyrannical and apparently powerless to stop.

"A case in point is the Aboriginal land rights movement," he said.

"The mining industry spent \$217 million last year on grass roots exploration, with much of that money remaining in Western Australia in the form of wages and salaries.

"Currently moves are under way which would see enormous areas of this State being excluded from exploration and development for the benefit of 2.4 per cent of the population.

"At best, conditions could be introduced which could deter exploration and development, as has happened in the Northern Territory and parts of South Australia, where exploration has virtually ceased."

CSO: 5100/7535

FUND FOR HEALTH CLAIMS IN URANIUM INDUSTRY SOUGHT

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 18 May 83 p 10

[Article by Peter Roberts]

[Text]

PERTH. — A national compensation fund is needed to deal with health claims from workers in the Australian uranium industry, the congress was told.

Mr P. McNamara, a lecturer in law at Adelaide University, said uranium workers were effectively restricted in their claims to ordinary workers' compensation.

This could not cover their special claims over issues such as lung cancer caused by radiation and genetic damage passed on to their descendants.

"The two areas in which reforms are most badly needed are in the areas of proof of causation and of securing the continued availability of a defendant," Mr McNamara said. "(At the moment) injuries of putatively radiogenic origin cannot in the present state of science be

proved to be connected with ionising radiation, whether in a mine or elsewhere."

Mr McNamara said a national compensation fund would be available to all workers and their descendants where the worker had received a prescribed minimum dosage of radiation. It would essentially operate as a monopoly workers' compensation insurer.

"Its liability would be absolute," he said. "Given that almost all uranium mined in Australia is destined for export, the most equitable manner in which the fund might be financed would be by way of an export levy on yellowcake."

Mr McNamara said a compensation system was needed even though technical issues in uranium mining were uncertain.

"The extent of the risks undertaken by workers cannot be measured and assessed with certainty," he said.

CSO: 5100/7535

BRIEFS

RADIOACTIVE DUMPING--THE Queensland Government came under fire from the Federal Government over its apparent failure to monitor the dumping of radioactive tailings in Brisbane backyards. The Minister for Health, Dr Blewett, said it appeared to be a very clear area of State responsibility. "One could argue that the Queensland Government should have been monitoring these tailings taken from Moreton Island and the Gold Coast, as has been done in other States. There seems to have been a failure on that Government's part now that it is known that people have used the sand to fill their backyards." Dr Blewett said he was disturbed at the long delays faced by Brisbane residents in having their soil samples tested by the State Government. He knew of one family where an application was made on October 27 last year and there was still not result available. It was also costing householders between \$8000 and \$12,000 to remove the contaminated sand. The minister was replying to a Queensland Labor backbencher, Mrs Elaine Darling, who asked if he was aware that the Queensland Health Department had notified over 100 householders that they had filled their yards with radioactive tailings. [Canberra THE AUSTRALIAN in English 26 May 83 p 6]

STUDY OF RADIOACTIVE MUSSELS--CANBERRA--A study of radioactive mussels in the Northern Territory will be increased to determine whether nearby uranium mining has polluted a valuable food source for local Aboriginal people. Aboriginal people eating several kilograms of the freshwater mussels a year from billabongs in Arnhem Land could absorb radium doses near to internationally recommended limits. The office of the Supervising Scientist in the Alligator Rivers region of Arnhem Land has accelerated its program of studying the mussels. The supervising scientist, Mr Bob Fry, yesterday met the Northern Land Council to pass on the results of a workshop conducted last week on the possible contamination of the mussels. The radiation levels can be attributed at least in part to natural causes: mussels are highly susceptible to absorbing radium, as well as heavy metals such as cadmium and lead, and the region contains some of the richest uranium deposits in the world. But at least week's workshop at Jabiru, near the Ranger uranium mine, the Atomic Energy Commission suggested the radium levels were high. [Stephen Mills] [Melbourne THE AGE in English 25 May 83 p 6]

CSO: 5100/7535

AFTERMATH OF FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN PACIFIC

Kuala Lumpur BUSINESS TIMES in English 2 May 83 p 20

[Article by Michael Hamel-Green in Honolulu]

[Text] SINCE Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a total of 228 nuclear bombs have been detonated in the Pacific region.

With the exception of two brief interludes in 1959-61 and 1963, the nuclear powers have been detonating bombs in the Pacific almost every year since Hiroshima. In their haste to develop new nuclear weapons, the nuclear powers have paid scant heed to the health and safety of Pacific people.

The deadly harvest of 66 bombs exploded in the Marshalls between 1946 and 1966 took years to appear. Today epidemics of cancer and thyroid tumours plague the islanders, especially those who are most prone to radiation: children and pregnant women.

The cruel aftermath of the 92 bombs France has tested in French Polynesia over the past two decades is only now becoming evident. Radiation is an unforgiving phenomenon. The tests of 10 or more years ago may well be forgotten, but the radioactive particles in the tissues of Pacific islanders do not forget — and the human price of these tests must still be paid in the currency of radiation-induced pain, suffering and death.

Chilling

Ever since General de Gaulle initiated the French Pacific test programme in 1963, succes-

sive French governments have reassured Pacific people and the international community that there would be absolutely no harmful effects — but have cynically suppressed all statistics that might verify or disprove their claims.

Beginning with the first tests in 1966, the French ceased issuing statistics on cancer and causes of death in the territory and have refused all requests for international monitoring of the health effects of the testing. Even the Mitterrand Socialist government, which made pre-election pledges of greater openness on nuclear matters, has continued this policy of suppression.

"No trace of any radionuclide has been detected in the ocean, or in any ocean living creature (as a result of French underground testing)," said the Minister for Defence, Mr Charles Hernu, recently. But instead of permitting the independent scientific monitoring that might verify this claim, the French government has chosen to embark on a public relations campaign to persuade Pacific governments that the tests are harmless.

Yet, if the tests are harmless, what is to be lost by allowing international monitoring?

Over the last 12 months new information has come to light that gives a chilling glimpse into what the French authorities are trying to conceal

— the blight of disease and contamination spreading outwards from the Moruroa test site.

Early in 1982, a French journalist, Luis Gonzales-Mata investigated reports of a cancer epidemic in French Polynesia for the highly respected Paris magazine, *Actuel*. Despite official attempts to prevent him from meeting people, Gonzales-Mata successfully interviewed Polynesians who had been sent to Paris for cancer treatment and islanders living close to the test site.

He discovered that from 1976 onwards the French authorities have been secretly sending large groups of Polynesians on military flights to Paris for treatment of unusual cancers. One of the most recent flights consisted of 50 Polynesians all suffering from brain cancer. They were taken to the Walde-Grace Hospital near Paris. A doctor at the hospital told Gonzales-Mata that the Polynesian patients were generally young adults during the period of French atmospheric testing (1966-74).

Gonzales-Mata succeeded in interviewing 29 of these patients after they returned to Tahiti. Other Polynesians suffering from cancer have privately sought treatment in New Zealand: between 1975 and 1978, the Dunedin Hospital alone treated 67 French Polynesians who had flown

there for treatment of cancer. An army doctor working for the French Polynesian government estimates that 10 per cent of the Polynesian population of the territory has now been sent overseas for treatment: of 98 overseas in 1979, 39 were cancer patients and 40 were children.

Visiting island groups close to the Moruroa test site, Gonzales-Mata found abnormally high incidences of ulcers, miscarriages and stomach troubles among Marquesas and Gambier islanders.

While much of the cancer appearing now can be attributed to the deadly fallout from the 41 atmospheric tests which France conducted between 1966 and 1974 — the result of ingestion into the body of radionuclides in contaminated fish, vegetables, air and rainwater used for drinking

— there can be little confidence that the continuing underground tests (51 through mid-1982) will prove any less deadly in the long term.

When the storm of international protest by Pacific peoples and governments forced the French to cease atmospheric testing at the end of 1974, the French government turned to underground testing, arguing that this would be perfectly safe. Many people were sufficiently convinced to cease the active protests they mounted in the early seventies.

In Australia and New Zealand, the conservative governments that took office at the end of 1975, while opposing French underground testing, have conspicuously failed to take the same vigorous action taken in the early seventies which included appeals to the International Court of Justice and the sending of naval frigates into the Moruroa test zone. In Australia's case, the Fraser government's will to resist French testing has been weakened by its wish to sell uranium to France.

Evidence

The complacency assumption that French underground testing is relatively safe was shattered, however, in late 1981, when the French and British Press published the findings of an internal report prepared by Atomic Energy Commission engineers and technicians working at Moruroa.

According to the engineers, repeated underground tests at the atoll were causing it to sink 2 centimetres after each test. Since underground testing commenced, the atoll had sunk more than 1.5 metres. A second report from the same source said that a 30 centimetre wide, 800 metre long crack had opened up on the atoll, and that radiation leakage into the ocean had been regularly occurring for years.

Equally disturbing were the details given in the reports of numerous serious accidents at the test site. On July 6, 1979, an explosion caused fire in an underground laboratory, killing one worker and injuring four others. The laboratory explosion spewed lethal radioactive plutonium into the surrounding ocean water. On July 25, 1979, a large 140 kiloton

bomb stuck halfway down the test shaft and was detonated where it had lodged; the resulting explosion registered 6.3 on the Richter scale, creating a localised tidal wave that washed over the atoll, injuring seven people.

On March 22, 1981, a tropical storm ripped off asphalt covering several pounds of deadly plutonium (with a radio active half life of 24,000 years) and flooded a 30,000-square metre radioactive waste storage area, washing much of the deadly debris in the sea. Defence Minister Hernu, in a September 1981 speech to the National Assembly, conceded that the March 22 accident had created a "new radiological situation" but denied that underground testing per se was causing any pollution. The waste washed into the sea was generated by French atmospheric testing, said Mr Hernu, not its underground test programme.

Further disturbing evidence that the French underground tests are dangerously contaminating the Pacific marine environment and food cycle has come from recent South Pacific Commission (SPC) and World Health Organisation reports on the ominous increase in the region of ciguatera, the debilitating fish poisoning disease.

The disease may last for years, and is sometimes fatal. Victims suffer severe muscular and nerve pain, diarrhoea, and paradoxical sensations (hot water feels cold and vice versa). The disease is caused by eating poisoned fish, which have become contaminated as a result of eating smaller fish feeding around ecologically dis-

turbed coral reefs where the ciguatera micro-organism has started proliferating excessively.

Experts who have studied the cycle that produces outbreaks of the disease believe that the ecological changes associated with increases in the ciguatera micro-organic may be due both to natural causes (earthquakes, storms) and man-made factors (pollution, shocks). Once part of a coral reef becomes infected with the organism, it tends to spread along the rest of the reef.

According to a SPC study in February 1961, there has been significant "flare-up of ciguatera" in the Gambier Islands, the closest group to the Moruroa test site. The epidemic was "preceded by the mass mortality of corals, which were found still dead in most of the grounds." According to the report, "human aggression on the living coral environment" is one of the most likely causes of ciguatera in the Gambiers.

Although the report did not specify the human aggression of nuclear tests to which it was referring, the most likely candidates seem to be the pollution and seismic shocks emanating from the Moruroa test site.

A new movement is beginning to develop amongst Pacific peoples to force the French — and all other nuclear powers — out of the Pacific.

Early in 1982, 1,000 Ni-Vanuatu demonstrated outside the French embassy in Vanuatu against continued French testing. Later in the year, two protest yachts, Pacific Peacemaker and Greenpeace III, made separate protest voyages into the Moruroa test zone. Anti-

nuclear organisations in Australia have launched boycott actions against the French airline UTA and French products and services. Further actions are planned at French embassies in early 1983.

Boycott

But the problem is not confined to French Polynesia. Ocean currents sweep past Moruroa to Fiji, the Cook Island, Australia, Papua New Guinea and New Zealand. Migratory fish, such as tuna and bonito, may become contaminated with ciguatera toxin in French Polynesia, yet be caught and consumed anywhere in the South Pacific. Already there have been unusual outbreaks of ciguatera in other parts of the South Pacific, including the Queensland coast of Australia.

Pacific people are demanding:

- Immediate cessation of French nuclear testing in the Pacific;

- Release of French Polynesian health and cancer statistics;

- Compensation and adequate medical treatment for all victims of French testing;

- A timetable for the granting of independence to French territories in the Pacific.

In a moving speech to the Pacific Trade Union Forum in September 1982, Jean-Marie Tiji-baud, Vice President of the New Caledonian Territorial Assembly, warned his audience of trade unionists from all over the Pacific.

"The great ocean that surrounds us carries the seeds of life. We must ensure that they don't become the seeds of death. These matters are our responsibility and we must face them to live and protect our lives." — Depth news Science.

NUCLEBRAS SUSPENDS SEVERAL NUCLEAR PROJECTS

PY061420 San Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 3 Jul 83 p 1

[Text] The 25-billion cruzeiro cut in this year's NUCLEBRAS investment budget has forced the enterprise to postpone until mid-1984 bids for the civil engineering work at the Iguape I and II nuclear plants in Sao Paulo. This information was provided by Mines and Energy Ministry advisors who also revealed that the construction of Angra 3 -- although it was contracted with the Andrade Gutierrez Company on 10 June -- was postponed, as was the construction of the plants for the exploitation and production of uranium concentrate in Itataia (Ceara State) and Lagoa Real (Bahia State). The advisors noted, however, that the timetable for the startup of Angra 2 and 3 and Iguape I and II has not been changed -- late 1988, 1989, 1991 and 1992 respectively -- because NUCLEBRAS expects to be able to compensate by 1985 for the cuts recently made in its budget.

CSO: 5100/2077

CUBA

BRIEFS

ATOMIC ENERGY AGREEMENT--The Cuban Atomic Energy Commission and the Hungarian National Atomic Energy Committee have signed a cooperation agreement and a work plan for 1983-1985. The two documents were signed by Fidel Castro Diaz-Balart and Gyorgy Osztrovszki, chiefs of the Cuban and Hungarian delegations to the 44th meeting of the CEMA Standing Committee on Atomic Energy for Peaceful Uses, held in the city of Pecs. [Text] [FL302219 Havana Domestic Service in Spanish 2027 GMT 30 Jun 83]

CSO: 5300/2155

BRIEFS

NUCLEAR TEST PREPARATIONS DENIED--New Delhi denied as totally unfounded and untrue an American newspaper report alleging that preparation are being made to explode a nuclear device in the Rajasthan desert. The newspaper had based its story on unnamed sources saying that additional shafts have been sunk at the site of the Pokhran explosion for another test. A spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry today categorically denied the report. The report was published by THE WASHINGTON POST. It has published similar stories about India's peaceful nuclear programs on two early occasions--once in December and again in February last. The union government had described the earlier reports as utterly irresponsible. [Text] [BK241604 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 24 Jun 83]

PATRIOT REPORTS EXPLOSION BY PAKISTAN--New Delhi, June 25 (AFP)--Pakistan has exploded a nuclear device in the range of 20-50 kilotons in the mountain ranges near Quetta, the pro-Moscow PATRIOT newspaper reported today quoting "highly competent sources." The paper said in a front-page story said the test blast was believed to have been carried out last 13 June, the first day of the Moslem holy month of Ramadan and the most auspicious day in the Moslem calendar. The report, signed by PATRIOT editor R.K. Mishra, said Indian scientists monitored a seismic event around 0230 GMT on 13 June that registered around 4.5 on the Richter scale. The epicentre was south of Quetta in the Ras Koh mountain ranges, it said. The PATRIOT said Islamabad could have succeeded in keeping the explosion under wraps by putting out a story of an earthquake in the region. But, nearly 2 weeks after the seismic event was recorded, there had been no mention of anything like it in the Pakistani media or the government. The paper noted it was well known that Pakistan had made preparations since 1979 for underground tests in the vicinity of Dalbandin in northwestern Baluchistan Province, which includes Quetta. It said U.S. and Soviet reconnaissance satellites had also confirmed that tunnelling was underway in the Ras Koh mountains, south east of Dalbandin. Against this background, the 13 June seismic event could only have been caused by a 20-50 kiloton range explosion, it quoted the informed experts as saying. [Text] [BK250500 Hong Kong AFP in English 0441 GMT 25 Jun 83]

SPOKESMAN UNSURE OF PAKISTANI EXPLOSION--There was what is called a seismic event in Pakistan 12 days ago, but its exact causes are not known. Asked by newsmen whether the event would be consistent with the nuclear explosion, an official spokesman in New Delhi replied it could be, it may not be. The spokesman was replying to a question on a New Delhi newspaper report that Pakistan had exploded a nuclear device in an underground test. He said the seismic

station of the Bhabha Atomic Research Center at Gawribidanur, near Bangalore, recorded a seismic event on the morning of Monday, the 13th of this month. The Pakistan Foreign Office in Islamabad and the Embassy in New Delhi have denied the press report describing it as false and baseless. [Text]
[BK251605 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1544 GMT 25 Jun 83]

CSO: 510C/4718

PAKISTAN REPORTED TO HAVE EXPLODED NUCLEAR DEVICE

BK010833 Delhi PATRIOT in English 25 Jun 83 p 1

[Article by R. K. Mishra]

[Text] Pakistan has exploded a nuclear device in the range of 20 to 50 kilotons in the mountain ranges near Quetta [in Baluchistan], according to highly competent sources engaged in monitoring Islamabad's plan to develop an atomic bomb.

The underground nuclear test carried out by Pakistan is being kept a closely guarded secret, these sources said. Pakistan's nuclear explosion is believed to have been carried out on 13 June, the first day of Ramadan--the most auspicious day in the Muslim calendar.

The seismic station of the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, located at Gauribidnaur, near Bangalore, recorded a seismic event in Pakistan at 080132 [as printed] hours (about 8.a.m.) on Monday, 13 June.

The magnitude of this seismic event was assessed at around 4.5 in the Richter scale with the epicentre south of Quetta in the Ras Koh mountain range.

Islamabad could have, perhaps, succeeded in concealing the fact of the explosion of the nuclear device if the Pakistan Government had put out a story that there was an earthquake in that region. But till now--more than 10 days after the seismic event was recorded--there has been no mention of the occurrence of an earthquake in this region by the Pakistan radio, television, press or the government.

It is known that since 1979 Pakistan has been making preparations for conducting underground nuclear tests in the vicinity of Dalbandin in Baluchistan.

U.S. and Soviet reconnaissance satellites are reported to have confirmed that tunnelling activities in the Ras Koh mountain range, south east of Dalbandin, have continued in 1980-81 also.

Against this background, the seismic indication of the magnitude, recorded at Gauribidnaur could, according to experts, be caused only by a nuclear underground explosion in the 20-50 kiloton range using the Ras Koh mountain region as a test site.

Pakistan's latest budget, beginning 1 July, provided Rs 493 million for development of atomic energy. Of this, the nuclear reprocessing plant and the 900 MW Chashma nuclear power plant were allocated Rs 403 million with a foreign exchange component of Rs 387 million, but the planning commission documents did not say how the money would be divided between the two. Since the power plant was still at the bid-tendering stage, experts had come to the obvious conclusion that a high proportion of the budgetary allocation was meant for the reprocessing plant. And since Pakistan does not have any plutonium-based power reactors, it was not difficult to conclude that the plutonium obtained from the reprocessing plant would end up in the armaments sector.

The Pakistan Government also allocated Rs 64 million for nuclear mineral survey and detailed exportation of uranium in Dera Gazi Khan district.

Recently, qualified U.S. observers also claimed to be in possession of incontrovertible evidence that Pakistan was not only attempting to go nuclear but also that it was receiving valuable assistance in this regard from China.

This led to a controversy in the U.S. Congress over the supply of sensitive military technology to Pakistan. Agitated over the disclosures about clandestine Chinese help in the latter's efforts to acquire nuclear weapons technology, many Congressmen apprehended that Pakistan might in return pass on advanced military technology to China. A U.S. Administration statement before a house sub-committee on foreign affairs conceded that the construction of unsafeguarded reprocessing and enrichment facilities and 'other Pakistani activities are consistent with an effort to develop a nuclear explosive capacity.'

The administration, however, tried to soft-pedal congressional opposition by saying that 'Pakistan could realise this capability within the next few years.' Experts say that the Pakistani underground explosion near Quetta shows that either the U.S. Administration deliberately misled the Congress or it was duped by Pakistani propaganda. Anyway, it approved massive supplies of modern military hardware to Pakistan.

The U.S. Administration ignored the warning given in November last year that Pakistan, which was operating the Khuta Nuclear Power Plant (KANUPP) for one and a half years at a reduced power level could have produced 10 to 20-kg of enriched plutonium enough for producing a couple of nuclear bombs. Dr Hans Blix, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, had said that Pakistan had accepted 'some but not all safeguards and unless the remaining ones were accepted the 'agency was not in a position to give an assurance that spent fuel was not being diverted for making nuclear bombs.'

CSO: 4600/717

SWEDISH DAILY ATTACKS SECRET PROVISIONS OF N-PACT WITH FRANCE

Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 17 Jun 83 p 2

[Editorial by Olle Alsen: "Fuel for the Nuclear Energy Fire"]

[Text] There is a discrepancy--amounting to many billions of kronor--between official calculations and the secret contracts governing the cost of reprocessing Sweden's spent nuclear fuel.

In its 1982 "Plan for the Radioactive Waste Products of Nuclear Energy," the SKBF (Swedish Nuclear Fuel Supply Company) says that reprocessing a total of 867 tons--including 727 tons to be reprocessed by France's COGEMA [Nuclear Materials General Company]--has been assigned a price tag of between 2,700 and 3,500 kronor per kilogram in January 1981 money values. A credit of 400 kronor is allowed for each kilogram of recovered uranium.

If for simplicity's sake we take the cost as being 3,000 kronor per kilogram, the total cost of reprocessing 867 tons comes to about 2.5 billion kronor, according to the SKBF. When asked, the company claims that that figure is supposed to cover all costs, including investments in the contemplated new plutonium plant (UP3A) in La Hague, France.

But according to paragraphs 12.2.3 et seq. of the contract and appendix 19--the latter document, a secret, is reproduced on this page [not included]--it is calculated that payments totaling a full 4,893.1 million francs in July 1977 money values will have to be made by the SKBF in the years from 1977 and 1990 as the Swedish share (620/6,000ths) of COGEMA's total cost for building the UP3A facilities.

What is more, the SKBF is obligated to pay that amount even if its reprocessing quota of 620 tons is not used, and on top of that, COGEMA is to receive a "commission" amounting to 25 percent of the total cost. The latter, however, can clearly be adjusted, and we will ignore it here. The COGEMA adventure is going to be preposterously expensive enough even without it.

This is especially true since as of March 1983, and according to the OECD index, French francs must be multiplied by a factor of 1.83 to retain the same real value that they had in July 1977.

This means that the approximately 4.9 billion francs shown in the contract as the SKBF's estimated share of the investment in the new plutonium plant corresponds to about 9 billion francs today, or about the same in Swedish kronor.

As far as we understand it, there are also special operating costs for reprocessing. They are estimated in the contract at 942.4 million francs for the 620 tons originally covered by the contract--that is, 1.52 million francs per ton.

According to other contracts with COGEMA, there are over 100 additional tons to be reprocessed. At a low estimate, the total cost would then equal 1.1 billion francs in July 1977 money values or, according to the index, about 2 billion francs today.

So to summarize: while the SKBF is announcing a total cost of about 2.5 billion Swedish kronor in 1981 money values, it can be seen from the COGEMA contract that the Swedish contribution to the UP3A investment will be 9 billion francs, in addition to 2 billion francs for the reprocessing itself in 1983 money values--in other words, about the same in Swedish kronor!

Even if the seemingly inexplicable gap between the officially announced 2.5 billion and the secretly contracted 11 billion for reprocessing could be reduced to some extent and explained by discounting to reflect present values and other subtleties--inquiries produce no explanations, since everything is secret--it is more probable that the gap will grow wider when the actual costs are known. Because as everyone knows, such costs usually turn out to be greater than expected. Everywhere in the contract, COGEMA has safeguarded its own interests with the provision that price increases will be borne only by the customers from Sweden, the FRG, Japan, and so on.

Putting it mildly, it is unlikely that COGEMA's investment and operating costs will become several times cheaper than estimated in the contract, and it is equally unlikely that we can expect any major haggling by the French--who have adamantly taken advantage of their monopoly position and who obviously induced the Swedish nuclear power industry to sign totally blank checks in 1977-1978 so that it could quickly satisfy the requirements of the Nuclear Safeguards Law. Instead, the industry should have delayed fueling any more reactors. By so doing, it might have gotten the system of direct storage without reprocessing, which would have been vastly cheaper, at least according to the estimates in its own KBS [Nuclear Fuel Safety]-2 and KBS-3 projects.

At this point, it is no longer good enough for the government and the industry simply to remain silent and use the secrecy classification as an excuse.

If the expected reprocessing costs were reported by the SKBF in a grossly misleading fashion and generally accepted by the Committee on the Handling of Spent Nuclear Fuel when the latter proposed the earmarking of 1.9 ore per kilowatt-hour of nuclear power in 1983 to cover the total cost of scrapping nuclear power (estimated just recently by the NAK [Nordic Atomic Coordinating Committee] at a little over 36 billion kronor), it means not only that the politicians and the public have been hoodwinked, but also that costs totaling many billions are

being left for future generations to pay and that today's nuclear power is based on a kind of fraud.

Reporter Sven Aner reported much of this information in articles that appeared in STOCKHOLMS-TIDNINGEN, the GOTEBORGS-POSTEN, and other newspapers. People in responsible quarters may perhaps try to ignore that. But he has also reported the matter to the National Accounting and Audit Office, where it is not likely that the matter can be shrugged off or hidden behind the stamp of secrecy.

11798

CSO: 5100/2614

PLANS FOR RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL DESCRIBED

Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 30 May 83 p 24

[Article by Carsten Salander]

[Text] The ordinance concerning adequate waste disposal for nuclear power plants, which the Federal Republic promulgated on the basis of the Atomic Law, can be implemented: Until the end of the 80's, France and Great Britain will take over the treatment of fuel elements. After this, nuclear equipment for the intermediate storage, reprocessing, and waste disposal in the Federal Republic will receive radioactive wastes that are generated here. The installations are partly being planned and are partly being constructed.

The best nuclear power plant - so argued the nuclear power experts in the late 50's - would be one with a paper moderated and ink cooled reactor. At a time when numerous nuclear reactor concepts were on the drawing board - in the Federal Republic alone a good dozen - and not a single one still had a genuine chance for implementation, not to say prospects for an economic breakthrough, such self irony was appropriate. At that time, it almost happened that all these projects were planned to the end and constructed.

Fortunately, most of the concepts again vanished in the drawer before they were implemented. A few were actually set up but were not started, and only a few, especially the boiling water and pressurized water reactors, have up to now provided the breakthrough to full economical operation: Today they deliver a kilowatt hour at a more favorable price than a German coal power plant.

With this economic comparison, is waste disposal perhaps being left out of account? Here, perhaps one could also assume that it too consists only of paper projects, because even the Federal Chancellor himself has recently said in his governmental declaration that waste disposal of nuclear power plants would have to be speedily implemented.

The technology of waste disposal not only has become well known in the meantime in all its individual steps and not only are its financial effects quite clear, but it has also been fully taken into account in the price calculations of the electrical utility enterprises. The responsible financial agency would not approve the reserves that must be set aside on this account, if actual waste disposal possibility

either domestically or abroad did not provide a foundation for this.

In fact, large-scale technical reprocessing installations were already operational when the first small experimental and prototype nuclear power plants began their operation. Waste disposal is solved and the planning of the Federal and Provincial governments as well as of the responsible corporations has been designed in such a way that the required installations are being built as needed.

Waste disposal of a nuclear power plant begins with the transport of the used-up fuel elements, includes the intermediate storage of these elements, as well as their reprocessing, and comprises the recycling of the valuable materials uranium and plutonium as well as the conditioning and final storage of the radioactive wastes in a salt mine.

The waste disposal of the German nuclear power plants will be affected, until the end of the 80's, essentially by the French reprocessing installation at the Hague and to a lesser extent by the British reprocessing installation in Sellafield (previously Windscale). The electrical utility enterprises have concluded contracts concerning this with the British Nuclear Fuels Ltd. in Great Britain and with Cogema Company in France. They have purchased e.g. approximately one third of the capacity of the French installation for a 10 year period corresponding to 2150 tons of used-up fuel elements.

This will finance the erection of the new large French reprocessing installation, which is being constructed on the same terrain next to the already existing reprocessing installation UP2. The financial burden which is thus imposed on German users of electricity is about 5 billion DM. The magnitude of this sum becomes intelligible if one considers that the power plants have generated more than 500 billion kilowatt hours with this fuel.

Since the waste disposal contracts with France and Great Britain will cover the waste disposal needs of the German nuclear power plants only until about 1987, the German Society for the Reprocessing of Nuclear Fuels mbH (DWK) must create technical capacities within the Federal Republic for the years subsequent to this. This holds for a nuclear power plant output of about 3000 MW, which is expected by the year 2000, i.e. about 800 tons used-up fuel elements per year.

At this time, an intermediate storage facility is being erected for this in Gorleben. Here, about 420 fuel element transport and storage containers with a total of 1500 tons of used up fuel elements stand in a large hall. At the end of the 80's, when nuclear power plants with about 20,000 MW electrical power will be operational, this depot will be filled after about three years.

It should also be mentioned that a second hall is being equipped in Gorleben, in addition to the depot for the used up fuel elements. In this second hall, the slightly radioactive wastes from nuclear installations, industry, medicine, and research institutes will be put into interim storage until, one day, the final depot in the Gorleben salt mine will become operational and they can be placed there for final storage.

The investment volume for the Gorleben interim depot is about 80 million DM. In letting contracts for this, the objective has been reached to take into account as much as possible companies of the regional business areas. At the beginning of 1984, the intermediate depot at Gorleben will be ready to operate. A second, equally large fuel element intermediate depot is anticipated in Ahaus. Construction approval for this is expected by the fall of 1983.

Experience with reprocessing is being made in the Federal Republic of Germany with the Karlsruhe reprocessing plant (WAK) - a prototype installation - which was started up in 1971 and which has reprocessed about 130 tons of partly highly burned-off light water reactor fuel elements. This installation as well as the research performed with the Karlsruhe Nuclear Research Center (KfK) have provided important operating experience. Our plans for larger installations build on this experience.

Since the end of 1982, parallel Atomic Law approval procedures are running both for these planned reprocessing installations with a daily throughput of two tons heavy metal (uranium) and for locations at Wackersdorf in the Schwandorf county and also Dragahn in the LÜchow-Dannenberg county. First site investigations concerning the construction terrain have already begun, and the safety report with the description of the installation will be made public already by the fall of this year.

The plans for the reprocessing installation anticipate the following installation areas: fuel element preparation, reprocessing, mixed oxide fabrication and fuel rod production, waste treatment, supply and management facilities. The investment volume presumably will be about four million DM and about 1800 employees will be occupied in this installation. If the first partial erection approval is granted by the end of 1984 or the beginning of 1985, the installation can start up in 1992. Here, too, the DWK will again strive for the broadest possible contract assignment to local and regional companies.

The question of radioactive wastes is the problem which has the greatest emphasis in current public discussion. Reprocessing in its technology and chemical methods is here scarcely still seriously questioned by the opponents of nuclear power. The point of agitation in public discussion now is the question of the elimination and retention of radioactive wastes.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, radioactive wastes are divided into three classes: weak, medium, and highly active wastes. Weak and medium active wastes are created in nuclear power plants, in medical colleges, in hospitals, during isotope production for medical research projects, i.e.: they already have been handled for a considerable period of time. Such wastes are bonded into cement, sealed in barrels, are put into intermediate storage, and finally are delivered to a final depot. By the end of 1978, the previous salt mine ASSE was used by the Society for Radiation and Environmental Research in Neuherberg (GSF) as an experimental final depot. Here, about 125,000 barrels with weakly radioactive wastes and 1300 barrels with medium active wastes were stored.

Fusing highly active waste into glass

In the reprocessing of used-up fuel elements, the highly radioactive fission products occur as the third category of radioactive wastes. These cannot be embedded in

in cement; because the radiation will destroy the cement structure, resulting in a risk of liberating radioactive products. A good possibility for safe inclusion of these wastes, however, is to vitrify them in a smelting furnace that has been specially developed for this purpose. This has already been implemented for several years on a large scale in Marcoule in Southern France and more recently also in Mol in Belgium by means of the PAMELA method that was developed in Germany. The installation there was erected by the DWK and is supposed to start operating in 1985. It will then vitrify the highly active liquid waste from the Eurochemie reprocessing installation.

All radioactive wastes which arise in the Federal Republic or which are returned later on from foreign reprocessing installations are to be imbedded in deep geological layers as has already been successfully tested in the ASSE. Because of the special stability of the north German salt mines, which have not altered their present and past form even during the generation of the Alps 17 million years ago, one can guarantee that these radioactive wastes will not be returned to the biosphere during a period of time when they could cause damage if they were carelessly handled.

The research work on the Gorleben salt mine, which is intended for this purpose, has up to now involved four deep borings, two borings to start shafts, and over 300 flat and salt level borings. There has been no indication that this very large salt mine may not be suitable. Consequently, the Physical-Technical Federal Institute in Braunschweig (PTB) - which is responsible in the Federal Republic, according to the Atomic Law, for the final storage of radioactive wastes - intends to begin in the following year with the excavation of shafts for the interior exploration of this salt mine.

Because of the very careful performance of the work and also because a planning procedure is still lacking, it will nevertheless not be until the middle or the end of the 90's before the first wastes can be stored in the Gorleben salt mine. Until that time, interim depots, which can be set up without major technical effort, as well as the previous metal mine Konrad in Salzgitter, can receive the wastes. An approval process for this is currently in progress.

For the sake of completeness, it should also be mentioned that, within the framework of a program initiated and financed by the Federal Ministry for Research and Technology, a method for the direct final storage of used-up fuel elements is also being developed. Especially with long term considerations involving the national economy, reprocessing with its recovery and renewed use possibilities of valuable energy raw materials certainly has advantages. Nevertheless, in special cases, it may certainly be important to have available such a method, for example for effective or for special research fuel elements. For this reason, the DWK has participated both materially and financially in this program.

Illustration

What happens to used up nuclear fuel?

Discharged from 15 German reactors since 1962: 1405 tons of used up fuel elements.
Of this:

29 percent reprocessed: 114 tons (8 percent) Karlsruhe reprocessing installation (WAK)

71 percent in storage: 300 tons (21 percent) foreign reprocessing stations
401 tons (29 percent) within the nuclear power plants
590 tons (42 percent) in reprocessing installations

8348
CS0:5100/2611

STATUS OF FUTURE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 30 May 83 p23

[Article by Werner H.F. Hünlich]

[Text] Now, in the middle of 1983, 11 commercial nuclear power plants with a gross rated power of 10 252 MW and four experimental or prototype installations with a total of 109 MW are being operated by the Federal Republic. Thus, the electrical business currently has available a nuclear power plant output of 10 361 MW total. Deducting in-house needs, 9850 MW net are available for this in the network.

In 1982, these installations generated 62.5 billion kWh and thus achieved a proportion of more than 20 percent of the total electrical generation of power plants in the public network. In the community nuclear power plant in Neckar-westheim, 1.1 billion kWh single phase current for the Federal Railroad was additionally generated and was delivered to its network.

Two 300 MW demonstration nuclear power plants - the high temperature reactor in Hamm-Schmehausen and the fast breeder reactor in Kalkar - as well as 10 commercial 1300 MW blocks with a total of 13 932 MW (13 150 MW net) are under construction and are supposed to be operational by 1990. Of this, six units with about 7000 MW will presumably be ready by 1985. Thus, at the end of 1985, a nuclear power plant output of about 17 360 MW (about 16 400 MW net) would be available.

By about 1990, according to the plans of the electrical utility enterprises (EVU), the remaining six installations of those that are currently under construction should be ready to operate with 6930 MW power. Further installations are being planned. The Wyhl nuclear power plant has already been approved and is not contained in the above figures.

It can be assumed that expansion by the year 2000 will take place by further 1300 MW units with a power of about 8000 MW, so that a total power of about 32 000 MW (about 30 000 MW net) in nuclear power plants would be available.

Here it has not been taken into account that, by that time, some older installations - especially the experimental installations which already have been operational since the 60's - will presumably be shut down.

During the last 10 years (since about 1973/74), the approval lead times - from the application for building approval until the granting of a first partial erection approval (first TEG) - has more than doubled from about one year to two and one half years. On the other hand, a simplification and simultaneously also a speed-up now appears to take place for the execution of the entire approval method, without any loss of safety or legal protection.

This is a consequence of measures in the organizational-administrative area, which concern both the applicant and also the approval agencies, as well as the official experts. These include in particular the following:

Uniform design of the installations by the applicant

Timely and complete presentation of verifiable documents

Uniform evaluations of the installations as regards the damage precautions which are required according to the state of science and technology

Acceptance and increased mutual recognition of expert opinions

A more precise definition of citizen participation in the case of significant changes in the design of the installations, so as to increase legal protection for all participants.

These measures will become operational for the first time - and consequently partly in a somewhat dragging way - with the three 1300 MW blocks in the nuclear power plants at Isar (KKI-2), Emsland (KKE) and Neckar (GKN-2), whose construction can be begun in 1982.

But also for other installations that are already under construction, it appears that the causes for the delayed execution of approval procedures have largely lost their effectiveness. These causes were based mainly in the unclear political statements concerning the utilization of energy for electrical power, i.e. in the nuclear controversy, as well as in changes of safety philosophy.

In particular, it is to be expected that, by 1983, the 1300 MW nuclear power plant Krümmel at Geesthacht an der Elbe will obtain operating approval as the next installation. The last partial erection approval (TEG) for an installation equipped with a boiling water reactor was granted on 7 March 1983. The nuclear start-up is planned for July 1983.

The 300 MW prototype installation with thorium high temperature reactor (THTR-300) in Uentrop-Schmehausen at Hamm/Westphalia is to receive its first partial operating approval in 1983. The Federal Minister of the Interior has informed the responsible approval agencies of North Rhine Westphalia, on the 8th of April, that he has no safety misgivings against the first partial operating approval (TBG). The reactor safety commission (RSK) has given a positive recommendation concerning this matter.

Building progress and the granting of the last TEG for the two 1300 MW blocks of the Gundremmingen power plant, in the middle of February 1983, leads one to expect that the start-up and acceptance deadlines for the years 1984 and 1985, respectively, can be adhered to. Operating approval is in progress.

The first hot test operation at the nuclear start-up of the 1360 MW units in the nuclear power plants at Phillipsburg (Block 2) and Grohnde is also anticipated in 1984. Hand-over of the installations is expected in 1985.

The trial operation of the 1300 MW power plant at Mülheim-Kärlich should take place in 1985/86. Its take-over is planned for the fall of 1986, according to the present status.

For the 300 MW prototype installation with the fast breeder reactor (SNR-300) in Kalkar, the Atomic Law approval method for the erection phase has already been practically concluded with the fifth TEG of 22 September 1982. On 3 December 1982, the German parliament furthermore decided to eliminate a reservation, which was placed four years earlier, on the start of the installation. Trial operation should now begin in 1986.

In December 1982, as a result of a new TEG, approval for the assembly of machine and electrical equipment was granted for the further erection of the 1360 MW nuclear power plant at Brokdorf. Start-up is intended in 1986/87.

The construction work on the construction sites of the 1300 MW units of the nuclear power plant Isar (Block 2) and Emsland - which were approved in 1982 in the "convoy procedure" - as well as of the first block of the community nuclear power plant at Neckar are making good progress. However, it is still too early to be quite definite whether start-up, planned for 1988/89, will actually be reached through the speeded up approval procedure.

The nuclear power plant Isar-2 for the first time contains practical equipment for power heat coupling for a remote heat supply based on nuclear energy. This will make possible a heat output which corresponds to the needs of about 24,000 residences.

For a total of nine further 1300 MW nuclear power plant blocks, applications for erection approvals have been made according to Par. 7 of the Atomic Law (AtG) or preliminary location decisions have been requested according to Par. 7a (AtG) - partly already for many years. Among these projects, several have been initially shelved.

The planning measures for waste removal from nuclear power plants finally begin to take form after many long years of political delay. The first intermediate storage depot for used-up fuel elements and light active waste in Gorleben will be completed by the end of 1983. The storage approval according to Par. 6 of the Atomic Law will presumably be granted very soon for this installation. The first TEG for a reprocessing installation is expected by the end of 1984 or the beginning of 1985. Expert opinions on safety already exist for a second intermediate depot in Ahaus. The preparatory investigations for planned final storage continue.

8348
CSO: 5100/2611

AMENDMENTS IN NUCLEAR POWER LAW CODE EXAMINED

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 14 Jun 83 p 21

[Article by Markku Hurmeranta: "Nuclear Waste Funds Under Control of Power Companies"]

[Text] Many years have gone into reforming the atomic energy law. A two-part committee report on this reform was completed in the years 1980--81. Now the finalizing of the law is once again beginning to be in the final stages. The draft of the law, which is still being worked on by officials, contains a total of approximately 80 articles, of which not even one is in the form presented by the original nuclear energy law committee.

Perhaps the greatest upheaval took place in the committee's proposal on the so-called nuclear waste fund, by which the power companies should be able to be held responsible for the storage of the nuclear waste produced by them as well as for the expenditures involved in demolishing a power plant.

In the second section of this report the committee proposed so-called outside funding as a form of preparation for this. In this model an outside fund, which would have been under the control of Ministry of Trade and Industry, would have been formed in the state budget in an amount determined by the cost of waste disposal for the power companies. The Ministry of Trade and Industry would also have determined the amount of the nuclear waste payment a year at a time.

According to the proposal the funds collected for nuclear waste funding would have been invested in the Bank of Finland, which would have paid interest on them.

Internal Funding Gaining Upper Hand

The refinement in present use or so-called internal funding was, however, chosen as the basis of the law in the preparations being made by officials.

Inasmuch as the law becomes a reality in the form presently outlined, the power companies will in the future have to make an internal provision for nuclear waste, the amount of which will be confirmed by the Ministry of Trade and Industry.

As a guarantee the state will demand either a kind of bank security as a primary choice or nuclear waste insurance as a second. This new area for the insurance companies would be made up of savings as well as risk insurance.

By making savings insurance payments to the insurance companies the power companies would have an opportunity to borrow back these funds, a system which is presently in use in the pension system.

The interest expressed by the insurance companies in managing this matter is understandable since the reserve obligation of the plants presently in operation, for example, would amount to a total of approximately 4 billion markkaa by the year 2010. Imatra Power's share of this amount is only 800 million markkaa since the nuclear waste produced by it or more hygienically stated, its spent fuel, will be transported to and stored in the USSR.

The share of Teollisuuden Voima [Industrial Power] will be more than 3 billion since its nuclear waste problem is yet to be resolved.

To date Imatra Power has accumulated approximately 60 million for this reserve and Industrial [Teollisuus] Power has accumulated approximately 350 million markkaa.

The law presently under consideration is by its nature a general law, which will entail a rather large group of statutes in the parliamentary deliberations on it. Because of its nature, there will not be a precise determination of the amount of the reserves. According to the law, they must only correspond with the expenditures needed for the final disposal of nuclear waste. What this will mean in each individual situation will be left to the discretion of officials.

The power companies will have to present their plans regarding waste management in submitting an application to the Council of State for the construction of a power plant. The plan will be more precisely defined in later stages of the permit process.

It will be interesting to note whether the reserve responsibility of the power companies will be extended to include so-called low-active waste also or whether the treatment of such waste will be left to the operational management of the power companies and will be covered by the normal annual budgets of the companies.

In the statements made in the nuclear energy law committee reports the opinions regarding the accomplishment of funding are divided into two groups. The majority of those making statements, however, supported outside funding. The most vehement opposition to this came from Industrial Power, which characterized the proposal on outside funding as a complete failure.

Thus the internal funding model recommended by Industrial Power seemed to be winning contrary to the stand of the committee and the majority of those making statements.

In its own statement Imatra Power declared that it has nothing against the idea of outside funding proposed by the committee. Outside funding was considered to be better from the point of view of the so-called total interests of society also. STTK [Finnish Federation of Technical Functionary Organizations], among others, made the concise statement that the responsibility created by the nuclear power plants for society is so great that it can only be assumed by the state. Thus STTK also considered outside funding under the control of the state in matters of waste treatment to be a better solution.

Industrial Power's criticism is primarily directed at the fact that it doubts that the value of the funds can be maintained with outside funding. In addition, Industrial Power has criticized the fact that a nuclear waste reserve in the Bank of Finland would be outside the reach of the power companies as compared to an insurance policy with a provision for borrowing back the funds, for example.

The People Will Have Their Say

The most revolutionary change in the new law compared to present stipulations will be the regulations on operational permits for new power plants.

In the future, parliament will decide on the construction of new nuclear power plants while until now the decisionmaking power has been in the hands of the Ministry of Trade and Industry. Indeed, the Ministry of Trade and Industry has not used this decisionmaking power, but decisions on present nuclear power plants have been made by the Council of State.

In the future, a power company will have to request a decision in principle for a nuclear power plant from the Council of State, which after studying the application will take the matter to parliament for its decision.

Before a decision in principle is made, the people will be provided a better opportunity than heretofore to make their own voice heard. According to the legislative proposal, a "general hearing" on a power plant project must be arranged or an opportunity in which the parties concerned can make their opinions public. The opinions presented will be made known to the Council of State before it makes its own proposal on a decision in principle. However, public opinion gathered in this way will not legally bind the Council of State.

Inasmuch as the parliament approves the power plant plans, a power company will be able to continue its plans. After that, the power company must apply for a construction permit, which will be granted by the Council of State. It is estimated that the planning work preceding a construction permit will take several years.

Not Through the Kitchen Door

The parliament's position as a decisionmaker is supported by the regulation according to which a power company cannot expend unreasonable funds (conclude

preliminary contracts with equipment suppliers, purchase uranium for its reserves, and so on) prior to a decision in principle. The purpose of this is to prevent a situation in which the parliament would have no other alternative but to approve a plan since its rejection would be too expensive for the power company as well as society.

10576

CSO: 5100/2613

RELUCTANT PARLIAMENT GETTING PROPOSAL FOR NEW NUCLEAR UNIT

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 14 Jun 83 p 21

[Article by Hannu Leinonen: "Government Dropping Energy Bomb on Parliament"]

[Text] In the fall the parliament will receive the nuclear power package, which has badly burned the hands of the government. The ministers do not even want to formulate a joint opinion on Finland's future energy law, but the burden of a solution is being placed on parliament.

However, the government says it will seek new material for the decisionmakers the whole time. Studies and reports will be made until the very end.

The acquisition of a nuclear power plant has been intertwined with a future nuclear energy law. However, the legislators have not been satisfied with the work of the original committee and a new proposal, for example, has subsequently been turned into a completely new religion as far as nuclear waste funding is concerned.

The intent in the Environmental Ministry is to initiate the compilation of reports as soon as possible on the environmental impact of this large power plant planned for Finland. In the reports initiated by Environmental Minister Matti Ahde (Social Democrat) the intent is to study the environmental risks of nuclear power as well as its alternatives so that the decisionmakers would have something other than reports from industry and business in making a decision on energy alternatives.

On Monday, yesterday, Ahde met with Trade and Industry Minister Seppo Lindblom (Social Democrat). The ministers clarified the manner in which the plans of the Environmental Ministry fit in with the studies now being conducted in the Ministry of Trade and Industry.

The reports being compiled by Lindblom and Ahde will be tied in with the large Finnish "atomic package" coming up before parliament in the fall. The government will first place the proposal on a nuclear energy law before parliament. The intent is to make a decision on the construction of a new nuclear power plant immediately after enactment of this law.

The discussions on this legislation and a fifth nuclear power plant will most likely take place one right after the other in parliament during the fall. A heated dispute between the supporters and opponents of nuclear power is expected. Even the government is expecting the struggle to be so fierce that it considers it best to leave the issue open in its own program. The nuclear power plant decision is being brought into the chambers of parliament quietly and without any fanfare.

In recent years nuclear power has become the subject of discussion at the congresses of each party. Most recently, at the Conservative Party congress in Lahti where the party adopted a positive stand on the acquisition of a fifth nuclear power plant after a week of heated debate.

Nuclear power is a significant divisive factor for the ruling parties. Except for the SMP [Finnish Rural Party], all the ruling parties are being torn in two directions.

HELSINGIN SANOMAT asked the government's ministers about their own opinion on increasing nuclear power. Only the opinions of Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa and Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen were not heard.

The question demonstrated that the majority of the ministers have not yet made a final decision on how they will react to the procurement of a new nuclear power plant.

Trade Ministers Were Least Hesitant

Both trade ministers, Trade and Industry Minister Seppo Lindblom (Social Democrat) and Foreign Trade Minister Jermu Laine (Social Democrat), took the most definite stand on behalf of the acquisition of a new nuclear power plant.

On the day he took his oath of office Lindblom adopted a clear stand on behalf of nuclear power. According to him, it is the only correct way to ensure that Finland will make it through the forthcoming years of competition.

Laine does not yet want to give a direct no or yes answer to nuclear power. He does, however, present four carefully thought out arguments as a justification for his position that "leans in a positive direction". According to Laine, natural resources should be conserved by means of abundant and cheap energy. Wood reserves can be saved by one-fourth by using abundant amounts of electricity. The development of new jobs in Finland will be based on a competitive technology according to Laine. Thus the availability and cost of energy will be decisive.

In Laine's opinion the energy forms competing with nuclear power are more harmful to the environment. In addition, the safety problems connected with nuclear power plants built in the Soviet Union and France have been resolved in a considerably much better manner than 10 years ago.

Laine points out that the timing of the procurement of nuclear power plants must be noted with care. Also the procurement of a 1000-megawatt power plant

is no longer the only solution. The construction of two smaller (500 MW) power plants would reduce the excessive one-time jump in production capacity, states Laine.

According to Environmental Minister Matti Ahde (Social Democrat), his basic attitude toward the procurement of additional nuclear power is critical. He urges that this issue be taken up again at a later date. According to Ahde, the environmental effects of energy alternatives should be clarified before a decision is made.

Puhakka Will Not Consent to a Commitment

Communications Minister Pauli Puhakka (Social Democrat) admits that he has not had time to study the issue and, therefore, does not want "to make any commitment" to which he must be bound in the future. According to him, there must be time to allow reasonable arguments to influence the formation of an opinion.

In principle Puhakka is of the opinion that energy should be made available to society in the most economical manner possible and the various production alternatives should be considered on this basis.

Holding nearly the same opinion is Interior Minister Matti Luttinen, according to whom experience to date has been positive from the point of view of nuclear energy. Luttinen points out that the residents of Lovisa are not living in a state of hysteria. Even the Lovisa City Council gave permission for the temporary storage of nuclear waste without a single dissenting voice.

In Luttinen's opinion the procurement of a nuclear power plant is all in all a difficult question since even the experts are divided into two camps.

The female Social Democratic ministers are clearly more cautious than their male counterparts in their views on nuclear power. According to Education Minister Kaarina Suonio, the increase in the need for electricity does not need to be of such a degree that a new large power plant must become inevitable. She leaned toward factors other than nuclear power alternatives in the procurement of a power plant. "The reports on natural gas can introduce a change into the picture if price questions can be clarified," stated Suonio.

Among the Social Democratic ministers the strongest negative stand is taken by Social and Health Minister Vappu Taipale, in whose opinion energy production is already sufficient since power plants are even now standing idle. "As a physician I take a critical attitude toward nuclear power," states Taipale.

Center Party Ministers Would Postpone Decision

The ministers of the Center Party would like to postpone the acquisition of a nuclear power plant by at least several years. The Center Party ministers are, in general, adopting a cooler attitude toward the procurement of a power plant than their Social Democratic colleagues. Several of the Center Party

ministers are, however, leaving enough room for movement in their opinions so that a final decision cannot yet be made.

Finance Minister Ahti Pekkala ties the opinions of his party's ministers to an answer according to which a solution could be postponed until the growth of the consumption of electricity and actual needs can be determined more precisely than at the present time. According to Pekkala, energy should be conserved more effectively than now in Finland. He does not forget to mention the domestic power sources noted in his party's platform.

Pekkala's opinions are contrary to his statement that production costs in Finland must not be higher than those in competing countries. In addition, all energy alternatives contain environmental risks, points out Pekkala.

Even Agriculture and Forestry Minister Toivo Ylajarvi describes his initial reaction as cool. According to him, we should aim toward a dispersed energy management instead of a centralized management.

According to Ylajarvi, a clarification of domestic alternatives should be made regardless of international price developments.

"My position is cautiously negative," states Defense Minister Veikko Pihlajamaki. According to him, energy policy in its entirety is in a casting ladle and no one can say what will happen. "Even though new knowledge about nuclear energy is constantly emerging, all the dangers to human beings have not yet been completely clarified," states Pihlajamaki. According to him, there should be a comparison to determine which forms of energy production present the greatest dangers and risks.

Among the Center Party ministers Social and Health Minister Eeva Kuuskoski-Vikatmaa took the most decisive stand against nuclear power. Her premise is that a power plant is not needed in this situation. "The risks in the use of nuclear power cannot be predicted in advance and reach beyond the present generation," states Kuuskoski-Vikatmaa. According to her, each large power plant alternative has its own problems and thus she has decided to recommend a decentralized system.

Taxell Discussed Morality

Justice Minister Christoffer Taxell of the Swedish People's Party would like to initiate a public discussion around nuclear power. According to him, a discussion on the direction of development has not been conducted even though the Greens have attempted to do this.

According to Taxell, the procurement of a nuclear power plant also entails ethical and moral questions, which so far have been discussed very little.

Taxell is not convinced that a new electric power plant would be needed in Finland in the early part of the 1990's. However, it is probable that a power plant will yet be needed in this century according to him. At that time the alternatives will be nuclear power or coal power. According to Taxell, a final decision on either alternative cannot yet be made.

Education Minister Gustav Bjorkstrand has also not taken a final stand on nuclear power. "My general premise has been that I have adopted a cautious attitude and, in general, I am for a soft alternative," states Bjorkstrand.

Finnish Rural Party Negative Without Reservation

Finance Minister Pekka Vennamo states vehemently: "Unreservedly against and Labor Minister Urho Leppanen joins in: Unconditionally opposed".

According to Vennamo, we should recommend decentralized alternatives such as small counterpressure power plants, which could produce heat as well as electricity. Even small diesel-powered power plants would be suitable in many respects according to Vennamo. They would be the best solution from the point of view of employment as well as sensitivity to risk, argues Vennamo.

According to Urpo Leppanen, the construction of a nuclear power plant would be a short-sighted economic solution. "Nuclear energy is not in any way cheap from the point of view of the total economy since, for example, employment would be reduced," states Leppanen. He proposes new alternatives and small power plants as another alternative.

10576

CSO: 5100/2613

FORSMARK PLANT GIVEN PERMISSION TO STORE SPENT FUEL

Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 23 Jun 83 p 24

[Article by Owe Nilsson: "Forsmark—Nuclear Waste Storage Approved"]

[Text] On Wednesday the government gave permission for storage at Forsmark of low and medium grade radioactive waste. All the requirements placed on the installation by the National Nuclear Power Inspection Board (SKI) were met, and both SKI and the National Institute of Radiation Protection (SSI) will have the right to make further demands.

The storage site will be built by the Swedish Nuclear Fuel Supply Company (SKBF). Material such as tools and protective clothing which has become radioactive due to work in a nuclear power plant will be stored there. Furthermore similar cleaning material from other industries, medical activity and research will be brought to the storage site.

SKI considered that the storage site was not the best location from a geological standpoint. There are weaknesses in the rocks because of the so-called Singo line which goes through the vicinity. SKI will require additional drilling before placement of the four concrete silos can be approved.

"In theory I can not deny that there are better places in the country," said Minister of Energy Birgitta Dahl to TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA. "But when both expert authorities SSI and SKI advise in favor, there is no reason for me to have another opinion."

The People's Campaign Against Nuclear Power is protesting strongly against the government's decision to give permission for the storage site.

SKI now has full control of what will be placed in the storage site. It can not be closed until it is full, around 2010. Then there will be an investigation of what happens in the storage site, and the government will decide when the sealing will take place.

SKBF is planning two additional storage sites at Forsmark for keeping hardened components and demolition residue from nuclear power plants when they are torn down. Osthannar County has requested that the government's permission apply only to the first storage site.

The storage site will cost 600 million kroner to build, and will be finished in 1988. Certain preparatory work can begin immediately. Construction itself will begin in August, according to Vattenfall's plans. One hundred Vattenfall workers will have jobs in 4 years.

Six Billion Missing in Calculations?

Did the Committee for the Management of Used Nuclear Fuel (NAK) overlook 6 billion kroner when it approved the calculations by SKBF of the costs for processing consumed nuclear fuel?

The National Accounting and Audit Bureau (RRV) will try to answer that, after an announcement by author Sven Aner. It is very unusual for RRV to respond to a statement by a private individual.

The nuclear power company, represented by SKBF, is responsible under the law for presenting cost calculations for future processing of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1981, the same year that the law came into effect, NAK was formed, and its job is to check these calculations.

According to SKBF's calculations (in the "Plan for the Radioactive Residue of Nuclear Power") the costs for processing a total of 869 tons of spent nuclear fuel will be 3 billion kroner.

Secret Agreement

Sven Aner, who has access to parts of the secret agreement between French Cogema and SKBF (see DAGENS NYHETER editorial of 17 June), has arrived at a cost figure almost three times as high, 8.8 billion kroner.

According to Sven Aner, the large difference is because SKBF did not include any cost for a share in the construction of plutonium factory UP3A at La Hague, France.

According to the "Cogema agreement" SKBF is obligated to pay that cost.

Sven Aner has now reported NAK to the RRV because it did not catch this in its review of SKBF's calculations.

Normally RRV does not make any revisions because of reports from the public. There has been no decision about revision in this case, but RRV has asked NAK to send in the figures on which its calculations are based "as soon as possible."

"We have not taken a position on this question, but we will look at whether there is reason to believe that Sven Aner is correct," said Hans Grohman at RRV.

"I do not understand what RRV has to do with this," said Gerhard Rundquist of NAK to DAGENS NYHETER. "Furthermore RRV received this information from us in October of last year. We have analyzed SKBF's figures and found them correct. Aner is wrong. If he has access to the Cogema agreement, he obviously can not read it."

9287

CSO: 5100/2617

SWEDEN

BRIEFS

NUCLEAR EXPERTS TO HARRISBURG--Swedish power companies and nuclear power experts have been invited to participate in the decontamination following the damage to the nuclear power plant at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Decontamination of the power plant is going to cost about 6.7 billion kronor.
[Text] [Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 24 Jun 83 p 7] 9287

CSO: 5100/2617

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

July 20, 1983